

## **II. EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY**

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Cong-Lac T. Huynh for taking the time to participate in a telephonic interview with Applicants' undersigned representative on April 20, 2005. During the interview, Stifelman, et al., "The Audio Notebook, Paper and Pen Interaction with Structured Speech," SIGCHI's 01, March 31-April 4, 2001, vol. 3, iss. 1, ACM 2001, pages 182-189 (hereafter, "Stifelman"), Davis et al., "Notepals: Lightweight Note Sharing by the Group, for the Group," ACM 1999, pages 338-345 (hereafter, "Davis"), and Mora et al. (U.S. Patent 6,161,113 [hereafter, "*Mora*"]) were discussed. Applicants' representative discussed why Stifelman, Davis, and *Mora*, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the limitations of independent claims 1 and 15.

Examiner Huynh agreed to allow claims 1, 4, 8, and 10-20 provided claim 1 was amended to change the sixth step to "storing the notation and the association for retrieval at a future time, where the future time is a time during the meeting," as indicated above. Accordingly, the agreed amendments have been made in claim 1. For similar reasons, the parallel amendments have also been made in claim 15. These amendments were subsequently approved in a telephone conversation between Examiner Huynh and Applicants' representative at approximately 5:00 P.M. EDT on April 20, 2005.

### **III. REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

These Remarks are in response to the Final Office Action mailed March 25, 2005 and are also in response to the Advisory Action mailed May 18, 2005. No fee is due for the addition of any new claims.

Claims 1, 4, 8, and 10-20 were pending in the Application prior to the Final Office Action. The Final Office Action rejected claims 1, 4, 8, and 10-20. The present response amends claims 1 and 15, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 1, 4, 8, and 10-20. Reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8, 11-12, and 14-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Stifelman, et al., "The Audio Notebook, Paper and Pen Interaction with Structured Speech," SIGCHI's 01, March 31-April 4, 2001, vol. 3, iss. 1, ACM 2001, pages 182-189 (hereafter, "Stifelman"). It is respectfully submitted that Stifelman does not anticipate the invention as claimed. Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being disclosed by Stifelman in view of Davis et al., "Notepals: Lightweight Note Sharing by the Group, for the Group," ACM 1999, pages 338-345 (hereafter, "Davis"). Claims 10 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being disclosed by Stifelman in view of Davis and further in view of Mora et al. (U.S. Patent 6,161,113 [hereafter, "Mora"])." Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claim 1 was rejected as unpatentable over Stifelman. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Stifelman teaches a non-networked standalone application for a single user and does not offer the option of remote access via the Internet. The current claims as amended, by contrast, disclose a networked, multi-user system ("at least one multimedia source") permitting access by multiple users from anywhere in the world where Internet access is available. Applicants respectfully note that these distinctions have not been addressed by the office actions. The current amendments to claim 1 specify that the future time is a time during the meeting. Amended claim 1 therefore allows meeting minutes to be accessed as they are being taken, in rough analogy with a stock ticker.

Stifelman does not teach this limitation. In its Response to Arguments (page 13), the Final Office Action suggests that Stifelman teaches this limitation. However, the Final Office Action notes that Stifelman discloses that "after recording the audio of a lecture or meeting based upon the notetaking by a user, the audio can be accessed by space or by time" (emphasis added). This

demonstrates that Stifelman does not disclose, and in fact teaches away from, the limitation in amended claim 1 that the future time is a time during the meeting.

The references cited in the Office Action, including Stifelman, Davis, and *Mora*, either singly or in combination, fail to disclose all of the limitations of claim 1. Claim 8 includes the limitation of transmitting the plurality of notations and their respective associations via an electronic network to at least one user. Stifelman, by contrast, teaches a non-networked standalone application for a single user and does not offer the option of remote access via the Internet.

Claims 4, 8, and 10-14 each ultimately depend from independent claim 1 and are believed patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims and because of additional limitations of these claims.

The Office Action notes (p. 10, lines 7-8) that claim 15 is found to be anticipated by Stifelman under analysis similar to the analysis of claim 1. Since the Office Action applies reasoning to support the rejection of claims 15 that is stated to be similar to the reasons for rejecting claim 1, with no further discussion provided, Applicants respond by incorporating by reference the responses given above with regard to claim 1. Claim 15 includes the additional limitation of transmitting the plurality of notations and their respective associations via an electronic network to at least one user. Stifelman, by contrast, teaches a non-networked standalone application for a single user and does not offer the option of remote access via the Internet. The current amendments to claim 15 specify that the future time is a time during the meeting. Amended claim 15 therefore allows meeting minutes to be accessed as they are being taken, in rough analogy with a stock ticker. Stifelman does not teach this limitation. Thus the cited sections of Stifelman do not disclose all the limitations of claim 15.

The references cited in the Office Action, including Stifelman, Davis, and *Mora*, either singly or in combination, fail to disclose all of the limitations of claim 15 as amended. Claims 16-20 each ultimately depend from independent claim 15 and are believed patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims and because of additional limitations of these claims.

Accordingly, claims 1, 4, 8, and 10-20 are believed patentable over the cited references and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

The references cited by the Examiner but not relied upon have been reviewed, but are not believed to render the claims unpatentable, either singly or in combination.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all remaining claims, as amended in the subject patent application, should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of the patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 5/31/05

By: J. Steven Svoboda  
J. Steven Svoboda  
Registration No. 44,366

FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-4156  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800  
Facsimile: (415) 362-2928  
e-mail: jss@fdml.com